

REMARKS

Status of Claims

The Office Action mailed May 20, 2005 has been reviewed and the comments of the Patent and Trademark Office have been considered. Claims 1-14 were pending in the application. Claims 1, 4, 11, and 14 have been amended, claims 2-3 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer and no new claims have been added. Therefore, claims 1 and 4-14 are pending and are submitted for reconsideration.

This Amendment changes and deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, are presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

Prior Art Rejections

In the Office Action, claims 1, 13 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 6,408,303 to Richards (hereafter "Richards") and U.S. patent no. 5,862,325 to Reed et al. (hereafter "Reed"). Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richards and Reed, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. patent 5,113,354 to Harper et al. (hereafter "Harper"). Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richards, Reed and Harper, as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of U.S. patent 6,662,197 to LeCrone et al. (hereafter "LeCrone"). Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richards and Reed, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. patent 6,418,400 to Webber (hereafter "Webber"). Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richards, Reed, Harper, LeCrone, and Webber. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richards and Reed, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Webber and U.S. patent 5,202,977 to Pasetes, Jr. et al. (hereafter "Pasetes"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Each of the pending independent claims 1, 11, and 14 recite a method (or program product) for processing an inbound document received from a trading partner in a business-to-business electronic data processing system in which, *inter alia*,⁽¹⁾ an auto-creation flag is stored for each of a plurality of interworking standards, and (2) a trading partner profile is

automatically created from a template only if the system determines that an auto-creation flag is set for the particular interworking standard determined to be associated with the received inbound document. Neither of the above two features are disclosed or suggested by the applied prior art.

Specifically, the office action implicitly acknowledges that neither Richards nor Reid disclose or suggest these features. With respect to claims 2 and 3 (where these features were previously recited), the office action cites to Harper for disclosing these claimed features (see paragraph 4 of the Office Action). However, the cited disclosure of Harper (including the cited portion on col. 9, lines 30-45) merely discloses that a certain modified data tag (MDT) flag (or attribute) that is associated with specific fields in a IBM 3270 display system may be preset. This disclosure is completely unrelated to the claimed (1) an auto-creation flag is stored for each of a plurality of interworking standards, and (2) a trading partner profile is automatically created from a template only if the system determines that an auto-creation flag is set for the particular interworking standard determined to be associated with the received inbound document. Accordingly, these recited features are not disclosed or suggested either by Richards, Reed, or Harper.

Furthermore, since none of these references disclose these claimed features, their reasonable combination (even if proper which we do not believe to be case) necessarily does not teach or suggest these claimed features. These deficiencies in Richards, Reed, or Harper are also not cured by any of the other applied references. Accordingly, the office action fails to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness as required by section 103.

The recited features provides the advantage that it allows the user to create templates that include default information for the particular interworking standards for which the auto-creation flag has been set. In fact, the type of templates may also be set for different standard levels as disclosed, for example, on page 6, lines 12-24 of the specification. Therefore, the applied prior art does not disclose either the specifically recited features or its advantages.

The dependent claims are also in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons, as discussed above, as the independent claims on which they ultimately depend. In addition, they recite additional patentable features when considered as a whole.

Conclusion

In view of the above applicants believe that the application is in condition for allowance. An indication of the same is respectfully requested. If there are any questions

regarding the application, or if an examiner's amendment would facilitate the allowance of one or more of the claims, the examiner is courteously invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the local telephone number below.

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account No. 19-0741 for any such fees; and applicants hereby petition for any needed extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date August 18, 2005

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP

Customer Number: 22428

Telephone: (202) 672-5485

Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Aaron C. Chatterjee

William T. Ellis

Registration No. 26,874

Aaron C. Chatterjee

Registration No. 41,398

Attorneys for Applicants